

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 12, 13, 16-19 and 25-33 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicants note that replacement sheets are being submitted herewith for Figs. 1-13. The replacement sheets are believed to overcome the objections noted on the Notice of Draftspersons Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO-948).

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slade (U.S. 6,269,275) in view of Bober et al. (Video Coding for Mobile Communications).

Claim 1, as amended, recites the feature of encrypting at least object data corresponding to specified objects which are predetermined among the plurality of objects based on control information corresponding to the object to be encrypted. Applicants submit that the cited prior art fails to teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious at least this feature of claim 1.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the “prior art is silent on the encryption of the objects being controlled by control information.” Accordingly, as claim 1 has been amended to recite that encrypting is based on control information corresponding to the object to be encrypted, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested.

Regarding independent claims 9, 12 and 13, Applicants submit that these claims have also been amended to recite that encrypting is based on control information corresponding to the object to be encrypted. Accordingly, as the cited prior art fails to teach, suggest, or otherwise

render obvious such a feature, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested.

B. The Examiner has rejected claim 29, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slade (U.S. 6,269,275) in view of Bober et al., and further in view of Spelman et al. (U.S. 5,638,445).

Claim 29, as amended, recites the feature of judging whether the scene description data is encrypted or not encrypted, and judging whether each object data is encrypted or not encrypted. Applicants submit that the cited prior art fails to teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious at least this feature of claim 29.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that “the prior art is silent on the determination of objects that are encrypted or unencrypted.” Accordingly, as claim 29 has been amended to recite the feature of judging whether the scene description data is encrypted or not encrypted, and judging whether each object data is encrypted or not encrypted, Applicants submit that claim 29 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested.

Regarding independent claims 30 and 31, Applicants submit that these claims have also been amended to recite the feature of judging whether the scene description data is encrypted or not encrypted, and judging whether each object data is encrypted or not encrypted. Accordingly, as the cited prior art fails to teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious such a feature, Applicants submit that claims 30 and 31 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 7, 8, 16-19, 25-28, 32 and 33 are allowed. Applicants also thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have rewritten claim 2 in independent form, thereby placing this claim in condition for allowance. Applicants have also rewritten claim 4 in independent form and have amended claim 4 in order to clarify that only object data of the specified objects is encrypted without encrypting the scene description data. Applicants submit that the cited prior art fails to teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious such a feature.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Toshiya TAKAHASHI

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE
FEE FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975.

By: Kenneth Fields
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicant

KWF/kes
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 29, 2004